

Task Force on FRBR and Continuing Resources
The Future: FRBR and FRANAR

I. Update on activities of groups working with FRBR

- Format Variation Working Group (Jennifer Bowen, Chair)

Initially appointed by the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR in 2001, this group is charged with exploring Expression-level cataloging.

The latest work of this group has focused on two documents for the JSC. The first includes an initial group of rule revision proposals covering the general rules in Chapter 25 (Uniform titles) of AACR. These proposals are aimed at creating Expression-level citations, and standardizing the manner in which catalogers construct and assign them.

The proposals were submitted to the JSC in Feb. 2003, and have received generally positive responses from JSC constituent members, with the understanding that additional work is necessary. The FVWG has been encouraged to continue their efforts in this direction.

From the FRBR perspective, the Expression-level attributes 'form of expression' and 'language of expression' have been cited by the FVWG as "meta-additions", or meta-qualifiers for uniform titles. That is, each contains only a finite number of possible values. By assigning these qualifiers as the initial elements and in an ordained sequence, serial uniform titles may achieve their traditional role of distinguishing titles while also collocating Works and Expressions.

In the earlier CONSER Meeting discussion of uniform titles for electronic serials by Kevin Randall and the Uniform Title Task Group (Doc. B2 on the CONSER OPCo agenda), the choice of the SMD "Online" qualifier represents a Manifestation-level attribute (e.g., 'form of carrier'). CONSER catalogers are also accustomed to seeing 'form of carrier' qualifiers in key titles and abbreviated key titles (\$b in 210/222 fields). These qualifiers--(Print), (Online), (Imprimé), (En ligne), etc.--are assigned by ISSN centers when serials are issued in multiple formats. In embracing Expression-level cataloging as described in FRBR, serials catalogers may need to rethink the manner in which we have constructed uniform titles. Specific material designations are Manifestation-level identifiers, and the use of transitory identifiers such as place of earliest publication is helpful only to distinguish titles.

As the FRBR conceptual model is incorporated into AACR, it is especially important that CONSER groups like the Uniform Title Task Group and the Task Force on FRBR and Continuing Resources monitor the progress of the Format Variation Working Group.

The second paper to the JSC from the FVWG describes the group's first attempts at an Expression-level identifier. Following the 2002 JSC suggestion to investigate the "deconstruction" of General Material Designations (GMDs) within MARC21 bibliographic records, a subgroup of the FVWG has issued an Interim Report for doing so. The report suggests replacing current GMDs with two separate identifiers: 'form of content' and 'form/mode of expression', and provides a list of possible terms for each. The subgroup asks for guidance from the JSC on their progress to date and directions for further study.

The Interim Report was submitted to the JSC in Feb. 2003. Three of the constituent members (LC, CCC (Canada) and ACOC (Australia)) have responded (ALA was unable to complete a formal response before the JSC meetings in Washington last week).

The responses are appreciative of the FVWG subgroup's work and acknowledge the complexity of the task. They are also in agreement with the subgroup that further work is necessary before some of the problems identified may be resolved. A discussion of the Interim Report was on the agenda for the April 23-25, 2003 JSC Meetings in Washington, D.C.

- CC:DA Taskforce on incorporating FRBR Terminology into AACR

At the end of 2001, the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR charged Pat Riva of McGill University with incorporating the FRBR Group 1 entities into the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.

Pat's third draft was submitted to the JSC in Feb. 2003. Formal responses were received from the Library of Congress, and the Canadian and Australian constituent members. ALA submitted a draft response to our JSC Representative, and discussions on the document were scheduled for the April 23-25, 2003 JSC Meetings in Washington, D.C.

- IFLA Working Group on FRANAR (Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records) (Glenn Patton, OCLC, Chair)

The charge of the FRANAR Working Group details three distinct goals:

1. to define functional requirements of authority records, continuing the work that the "Functional requirements of bibliographic records" for bibliographic systems initiated.

2. to study the feasibility of an International Standard Authority Data Number (ISADN), to define possible use and users, to determine for what types of authority records such an ISADN is necessary, to examine the possible structure of the number and the type of management that would be necessary.

3. to serve as the official IFLA liaison to and work with other interested groups concerning authority files : INDECS (Interoperability of Data in E-Commerce Systems), ICA/CDS (International Council on Archives / Committee on Descriptive Standards), ISO/TC46 for international numbering and descriptive standards, CERL (Consortium of European Research Libraries), etc.

Currently, the group hopes to have a draft FRANAR document out for worldwide review by the end of 2003.

Upcoming meetings of the FRANAR Working Group include a meeting in Zagreb at the end of May, and at the IFLA Conference in Berlin during August.

A paper detailing the work of the group through Dec. 2002 written by Glenn Patton is available at:

http://www.unifi.it/universita/biblioteche/ac/relazioni/patton_eng.pdf

However, Glenn warns that much of the current thinking of the Working Group, and the models in the paper, have since changed. Stay tuned.

- IFLA Working Group to Monitor the Implementation of FRBR (Patrick LeBoeuf, Bibliotheque national de France, Chair)

IFLA has established this working group to monitor the progress of implementations of FRBR in the international library community. The group is also responsible for revising the FRBR document published by IFLA in 1998 as necessary.

- CONSER FRBR Task Force on Continuing Resources
(Everett Allgood & Ed Jones, co-chairs)

An advisory group established at the 2002 CONSER Operations Meeting.
The charge of the CONSER FRBR Task Force reads :

Charge

- Consider the entities, attributes and relationships as described in the FRBR and their application to serials and other continuing resources.
- Provide serial examples for the paper “Displays for Multiple Versions from MARC 21 and FRBR”
- Evaluate reports of the JSC Format Variation Working Group and provide feedback relating to continuing resources
- Monitor activities regarding the use of FRBR and provide reports, analysis, feedback, as deemed appropriate

Current activities include an examination of the FRBR Group 1 Entities *Work* and *Expression*, especially the serial-related attributes. Most of the examples in FRBR are for music or literary resources. There are very few serial or continuing resource examples. The Task Force wants to ascertain that each of the Entity attributes is assigned to the correct Entity for all bibliographic materials – not just single-part resources.

If the TF discovers attributes that need to be realigned to facilitate FRBR’s ability to handle Continuing Resources, Patrick LeBoeuf’s “IFLA Working Group to Monitor the Implementation of FRBR” referenced above will be the conduit for FRBR revision.

Also in accord with our charge, the Task Force has established an ongoing relationship with the JSC Format Variation Working Group. The two groups have held joint meetings at the last two ALA Conferences and continue to cooperate in our efforts to implement the FRBR conceptual model.

The FRBR TF will also be very interested to see the IFLA Working Group on FRANAR draft document later this year. The eventual FRBR/FranAR relationship should prove beneficial in exposing the strong existing relationships between Bibliographic and Authority records in library catalogs. The possibility of coordinating catalog displays of the abstract FRBR Entities *Work* and *Expression* via authority citations alluded to in the JSC Format Variation Working Group revision proposals for Chapter 25 (Uniform titles) is intriguing.

II. Questions for discussion

- *Relator terms*

One FRBR-related discussion at one of the 2003 ALA Midwinter CC:DA meetings may require further PCC consideration. The issue was raised that Chapter 5 of the FRBR conceptual model expressly states the necessity to define the relationship of persons and corporate bodies to the Manifestation/Expression/Work being cataloged. This is necessary in order to create a truly robust catalog more fully capable of expressing and displaying relationships.

Current PCC policy (in accord with LCRI 21.0D) instructs catalogers NOT to include Relator terms or Relator codes except in certain limited situations. The MARC21 format currently allows the encoding of these Relator terms or codes via the 700/710 \$e (Relator term) or \$4 (Relator code).

In light of the Joint Steering Committee plans to incorporate FRBR into the cataloging code, is it time for PCC to reconsider this LCRI?

- *Uniform title qualifiers*

In thinking further about the JSC Format Variation Working Group Chapter 25 recommendations regarding the Expression-level attributes ‘form of expression’ and ‘language of expression’, continuing resource catalogers need to consider how, or if these qualifiers are significant.

While these qualifiers will certainly help to define and collocate music and literary materials, how helpful will they be for serials that are predominantly textual?

1. What exactly do we mean by ‘form of expression’?

(FRBR defines ‘form of expression’ as “the means by which the *Work* is realized (e.g., through alpha-numeric notation, musical notation, spoken word, musical sound, cartographic image, photographic image, sculpture, dance, mime, etc.)”)

Meanwhile, ‘form of work’ is defined by FRBR as “the class to which the *Work* belongs (e.g., novel, play, poem, essay, biography, symphony, concerto, sonata, map, drawing, painting, photograph, etc.)” These are genre headings, and again most are subdivisions within the realms of literature and music.

Do the FRBR examples require further examination? For example, do the serial-related sub-genres "newspaper" "journal" and "annual report" belong as ‘forms of works’?

2. If ‘form of expression’ and language of expression’ are not helpful as uniform title qualifiers for serials and continuing resources, what attributes are?

3. What about those qualifiers we most often currently use for serials (e.g., place, date, corporate body, etc.)? Are these still valid within a cataloging code in part dependent upon the FRBR model? Can they fulfill the joint roles we now see as important for uniform titles – to *distinguish* as well as to *collocate*?

- *Aggregator-Neutral record*

Where does the ‘aggregator-neutral’ record fit into FRBR? Since it includes multiple manifestations, it is not at the manifestation level. However, it doesn’t include all of the physical manifestations, so it is also not at the expression level. Does this matter? Can we foresee ramifications for the future? What would we ideally like to see as a multiple versions solution coming from FRBR?